

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

On August 17, 2005, attorney for applicants and the Examiner held a phone interview discussing a proposed amendment to independent claims 1, 5, and 9. The Examiner indicated that such amendment appears to distinguish over the cited art, but that further consideration of the arguments was necessary. Applicants have amended the claims as discussed and submit that all amended and pending claims are patentable and in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-12 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Edberg (U.S. Patent No. 5,793,381) and Chiang (U.S. Patent No. 6,003,049). Applicants traverse.

Amended claims 1, 5, and 9 concern translating a source character string in a first character encoding into a target character string in a second character encoding. A plurality of specifications are maintained, wherein each specification has one of a plurality of scopes, and wherein each specification identifies at least one code page providing a mapping for source character strings in the first character encoding, and the specification scope specifies a portion of the program to which the code page identified by the specification applies. A source character string is processed for which translation is requested in the program. A determination is made of one specification having one scope that is applicable to the processed source character string. The code page identified by the determined specification is used to translate the processed source character string in the first character encoding into the target character string in the second character encoding.

Applicants amended the claims to clarify the recitation of the claim elements, including the specification, code page and scope. These claimed definitions are disclosed on at least pgs. 16 and 22-27 of the Specification. Applicants added the requirements of processing a source character string for which translation is requested in the program and determining one specification having one scope that is applicable to the processed source character string. These added requirements are disclosed on at least pgs. 22-27 and 31-32 of the Specification. The Specification further discloses the added requirement of using the code page identified by the determined specification to translate the processed source string into a target string on pgs. 28-33.

The Examiner recognized that Edberg fails to teach a specification of and translating one of a plurality of scopes where each scope specifies a different portion of a computer program subject to translation. The Examiner then cited col. 5, lines 45-50 of Chiang as teaching the requirements concerning specifications having different scopes. (Third Office Action, pg. 3) Applicants traverse.

The amended claims recite a plurality of specifications, wherein each specification has one of a plurality of scopes, wherein each specification identifies at least one code page providing a mapping for source strings and the scopes specify different portions of the program to which the code page applies.

The cited col. 5 of Chiang mentions translating an English program to a Chinese program and then decomposing each Chinese character employed according to standard strokes. Chiang further mentions that its “major contribution” is to provide an organized framework upon which a stream of Chinese characters can be placed in a sequential order according to the bit patterns generated from the stroke sequence of each character. (Chiang, col. 5, lines 55-65) Thus, Chiang concerns how to represent the strokes of Chinese characters in binary codes.

Nowhere does the cited Chiang anywhere teach or suggest a plurality of specifications, wherein each specification has one of a plurality of scopes, wherein each specification identifies at least one code page providing a mapping for source strings and the scopes specify different portions of the program to which the code page applies. Instead, the cited Chiang discusses how to decompose a Chinese character into standard strokes. There is no mention of providing specifications having different scopes identifying code pages used to translate a source character string into a target character string.

Further, nowhere does the cited art teach or suggest the claim requirement of determining one specification having one scope that is applicable to the processed source character string. As noted, the Examiner recognized that Edberg failed to teach specifications having one of a plurality of scopes. Further, nowhere does the cited Chiang discuss determining one specification having a scope applicable to a processed source character string and using the code page for the determined specification to translate the source character string. Instead, the cited Chiang discusses how to decompose a Chinese character into standard strokes.

Accordingly, the amended claims 1, 5, and 9 are patentable over the cited art because the cited Edberg and Chiang do not teach or suggest all the claim requirements.

Amended claims 2-4, 6-8, and 10-12 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from amended claims 1, 5, and 9, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. Further, the following dependent claims provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Applicants amended claims 2-4, 6-8, and 10-12 to clarify the claim language.

Claims 2, 6, and 10 depend from claims 1, 5, and 9 and further require that a global scope specifies that the code page applies to an entirety of the computer program.

The Examiner recognized that Edberg does not teach a global scope specifying that the translation applies to an entirety of the computer program and cited col. 5, lines 45-50 of Chiang as overcoming this deficiency in Edberg. (Third Office Action, pg. 4) Applicants traverse.

The cited col. 5 of Chiang mentions translating an English program to a Chinese program and then decomposing each Chinese character employed according to standard strokes. Chiang further mentions that its "major contribution" is to provide an organized framework upon which a stream of Chinese characters can be placed in a sequential order according to the bit patterns generated from the stroke sequence of each character. (Chiang, col. 5, lines 55-65) Thus, Chiang concerns how to represent the strokes of Chinese characters in binary codes.

Nowhere does the cited col. 5 anywhere teach or suggest a code page providing a mapping for character strings in the first character encoding that has a scope indicating that the code page applies to the entire computer program. Instead, the cited Chiang discusses how to decompose Chinese characters into strokes and ordering the characters according to the bit patterns generated from the stroke sequence of the characters.

Accordingly, claims 2, 6, and 10 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not taught or suggested in the cited art.

Applicants further submit that amended claims 3 and 4; 7 and 8; and 11 and 12 are patentable over the cited Edberg and Chiang for the reasons discussed with respect to claims 2, 6, and 10 because they specify different scopes indicating that the specification is used for

translation with respect to a subsequent portion of the program (claims 3, 7, and 11) and a specific constant (4, 8, and 12).

Nowhere does the cited Chiang anywhere teach or suggest code pages having scopes that apply to subsequent portions of the program and a specific constant. Instead, the cited Chiang discusses how to decompose Chinese characters into strokes and ordering the characters according to the bit patterns generated from the stroke sequence of the characters.

Accordingly, claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 11, and 12 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not taught or suggested in the cited art.

Added claims 13, 16, and 19 depend from claims 1, 5, and 9, respectively, and further require that the first character encoding comprises a non-Unicode encoding and wherein the second character encoding comprises Unicode.

The added requirements of these claims are disclosed on at least pg. 9 of the Specification that discusses translating non-Unicode characters to Unicode characters.

Applicants submit that claims 13, 16, and 19 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from claims 1, 5, and 9, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above and because the additional requirements of these claims in combination with the base claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Added claims 14, 17, and 20 depend from claims 1, 5, and 9, respectively, and further require that a global scope specifies that a code page applies to the entire computer program, wherein a local scope specifies that a code page applies to a subsequent portion of the computer program following a program statement specifying the local scope, and wherein a constant specific scope specifies that a code page applies to a specific constant, wherein the determined specification comprises the specification having the constant specific scope when specifications of a global or local scope and the constant specific scope are applicable to the processed source character string, and wherein the determined specification comprises the specification having the local scope when specifications of a global and local scopes are applicable to the processed source character string. the first character encoding comprises a non-Unicode encoding and wherein the second character encoding comprises Unicode.

The added requirements of these claims are disclosed on at least pgs. 12-27 of the Specification.

Applicants submit that claims 14, 17, and 20 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from claims 1, 5, and 9, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above and because the additional requirements of these claims in combination with the base claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Added claims 15, 18, and 21 depend from claims 1, 5, and 9, respectively, and further require that using the code page identified by the determined specification to translate the processed source character string into the target character string comprises: using the code page identified by the determined specification to translate the processed source character string into a value; determining a mapping table associated with the code page identified by the determined specification; and using the determined mapping table to map the value to the target character string.

The added requirements of these claims are disclosed on at least pg. 28-33 of the Specification that discusses using the mapping table.

Applicants submit that claims 15, 18, and 21 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from claims 1, 5, and 9, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above and because the additional requirements of these claims in combination with the base claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1-21 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants submit herewith the fee for the added claim and for a two-month extension of time. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0460.

\\

\\

\\

\\

\\

Amdt. dated August 18, 2005
Reply to Office action of April 15, 2005

Serial No. 09/613,085
Docket No. STL920000069
Firm No. 0054.0034

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: August 18, 2005

By: 

David W. Victor
Registration No. 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David Victor
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: 310-553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984